Application No. Applicant(s) 09/944,389 DAVIS ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 1641 Bao-Thuy L. Nguyen All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Bao-Thuy L. Nguyen - PTO. (4)____ (2) Marina Larson - App. Rep.. Date of Interview: 30 April 2002. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: ____ Claim(s) discussed: all of record. Identification of prior art discussed: 4,943,522; 4,861,711; 5,591,645. Agreement with respect to the claims f(x) = x + x + y = x +Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Larson explained the most relevant art of record and specified differences between claimed invention and those of the prior art. Proposed claim amendments to better define invention and will submit them in a preliminary amendment . (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required